

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

|            |   |           |                 |
|------------|---|-----------|-----------------|
| Applicant  | : Sev K. H. Keil et al.                             | Art Unit  | : 3688          |
| Serial No. | : 09/845,051  | Examiner  | : Daniel Lastra |
| Filed      | : April 27, 2001                                    | Conf. No. | : 1476          |
| Title      | : SYSTEM TO PROVIDE CONSUMER PREFERENCE INFORMATION |           |                 |

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants again thank Examiner Lastra for the telephonic interview conducted with applicants' representative Andrew Foy on June 23, 2009 and for the Interview Summary provided by Examiner Lastra on June 29, 2009, a copy of which is attached hereto.

In reviewing the Interview Summary provided by Examiner Lastra, applicants note that the telephonic interview was conducted on June 23, 2009, not June 9, 2009, as suggested by the Interview Summary. Further, applicants submit that independent claim 1 is allowable because of the combination of the features recited in independent claim 1 including "predicting the first consumer's answers to the first set of trade-off questions," "receiving answers to the first set of trade-off questions from the first consumer," "determining a first adjustment factor for use in adjusting the stored value that is reflective of the first consumer's preference for the at least one attribute level," "adjusting the stored value that is reflective of the first consumer's preference for the at least one attribute level as a function of the determined first adjustment factor and the average value of the first sub-group's preference for the at least one attribute level," and others, not just because independent claim 1 recites determining an adjustment factor, as suggested by the Interview Summary provided by Examiner Lastra.

In addition, applicants note that the Interview Summary provided by Examiner Lastra cites several of the figures from applicants' application as illustrative examples of features recited in independent claim 1. While the figures cited in the Interview Summary provided by Examiner Lastra may be illustrative examples of features recited in independent claim 1, applicants note that it is the language of the claim itself that defines the metes and bounds of the claim and that independent claim 1 is not limited to the illustrative examples of features that appear in the cited figures.


Applicant : Sev K. H. Keil et al.  
Serial No. : 09/845,051  
Filed : April 27, 2001  
Page : 2 of 2

Attorney's Docket No.: 24491-0007001

No fees are believed due in connection with the filing of this Interview Summary.  
However, in the event that any charges or credits are due in connection with the filing of this Interview Summary or otherwise, please apply any such charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 7, 2009

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew T. Foy  
Reg. No. 57,333

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

40577978.doc



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/845,051      | 04/27/2001  | Sev K. H. Keil       | 24-491-0007001      | 1476             |

|                            |      |            |
|----------------------------|------|------------|
| 26171                      | 7590 | 06/29/2009 |
| FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.     |      |            |
| P.O. BOX 1022              |      |            |
| MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022 |      |            |

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| EXAMINER       |  |
| LASTRA, DANIEL |  |

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 3688     |              |

|                   |               |
|-------------------|---------------|
| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| 06/29/2009        | ELECTRONIC    |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

|                          |                        |  |                     |  |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> |  | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                          | 09/845,051             |  | KEIL ET AL.         |  |
|                          | <b>Examiner</b>        |  | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                          | DANIEL LASTRA          |  | 3688                |  |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DANIEL LASTRA (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Andrew T. Foy (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 06/09/09.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Herz (US 6,029,195) and Using Extremes to design products and segment markets (Dialog file 75/00184535).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/DANIEL LASTRA/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3688

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant's representative mentioned that the novelty of the invention is based on the consumer's received answers to a set of trade-off questions (see figure 9) and the predicted answers to the first set of trade-off questions for the consumer (see figure 6), determining an adjustment factor for use in adjusting the stored value that is reflective of the consumer's preference for at least one attribute level, adjusting the stored value that is reflective of the consumer's preference for at least one attribute (see figure 6) as a function of the determined adjustment factor and the average value of the subgroup preference for at least one attribute level (see figure 12) to obtain figure 14. The Applicant's mentions that the novelty of the invention is finding said "adjustment factor". The Examiner mentioned a problem in claim 1 regarding an antecedent problem of "the user". The Applicant's representative mentioned that he would submit a supplementary amendment to correct said problem. .